3-2017

Predicting and Reducing Aggression and Violence Toward Teachers: Extent of the Problem and Why it Matters

Susan D. McMahon
DePaul University

Andrew Martinez
Sacred Heart University, martineza5@sacredheart.edu

Linda A. Reddy
Rutgers University - New Brunswick/Piscataway

Dorothy L. Espelage
University of Illinois at Florida

Eric M. Anderman
Ohio State University - Main Campus

Recommended Citation

McMahon, S.D., Martinez, A., Reddy, L.A., Espelage, D.L. & Anderman, E.M. (2017). Predicting and reducing aggression and violence toward teachers: Extent of the problem and why it matters. In P. Sturmey (Ed.), The Wiley handbook of violence and aggression. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons

Predicting and Reducing Aggression and Violence Toward Teachers: Extent of the Problem and Why It Matters

Chapter · March 2017

1 author:

Andrew Martinez

Sacred Heart University

11 PUBLICATIONS   **49** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project
Involvement in Extracurricular Activities: Identifying Differences in Perceptions of School Climate
View project

Project
State Anti-Bullying Policies View project

100

Predicting and Reducing Aggression and Violence Toward Teachers: Extent of the Problem and Why It Matters

Susan D. McMahon
DePaul University, USA

Andrew Martinez
Sacred Heart University, USA

Linda A. Reddy
Rutgers University, USA

Dorothy L. Espelage
University of Illinois at Florida, USA

Eric M. Anderman
The Ohio State University, USA

Introduction to Teacher-Directed Violence

Teacher-directed violence is rooted within the pervasive problem of school violence. Although most research has focused on students, national and state-level studies suggest that the problem of teacher-directed violence warrants attention by researchers, policy makers, and school stakeholders (Espelage, Anderman et al., 2013). A national US study conducted by McMahon and colleagues (2014) found that approximately 80% of 2,998 teachers reported experiencing at least 1 of 11 forms of victimization, ranging from obscene remarks to physical attacks, within the current or past year. Given that teacher-directed violence and work performance are linked and that in the United States approximately 17% of new teachers leave the profession within the first 5 years of teaching, there is an urgent need to better understand this problem (Gray & Taie, 2015).

Types of Violence Reported by Teachers

Previous work has focused on the more severe forms of violence (e.g., physical attacks; e.g., Robers, Zhang, & Truman, 2010). However, burgeoning studies have also examined a wider range of types of victimization with the understanding that "low-level" forms of teacher-directed

---

violence can have serious effects and can escalate into more severe violence. This broader view of violence differs from popular portrayals of school violence in the media, such as school shootings, and suggests that teachers are commonly exposed to nonphysical forms of violence. For example, research conducted among 6,469 teachers in Minnesota revealed that nonphysical workplace violence was five times more common than physical violence (Gerberich et 2011). Regarding nonphysical violence, verbal abuse has been found to be most the common type (McMahon et al., 2014; Tiesman, Konda, Hendricks, Mercer, & Amandus, 2013); however, others forms of nonphysical violence such as threats, intimidation, property offenses, bullying, and sexual harassment are also common (McMahon et al., 2014; Tiesman et al., 2013).

Variations Across Teacher and Contextual Characteristics

Although this body of research has examined physical and nonphysical violence, a more complex picture emerges in terms of *who* experiences violence, which *forms* of violence are experienced (e.g., physical attack, harassment), and *by whom* (e.g., students, colleagues). There is considerable variation in the experience of teacher-directed violence and a social–ecological framework can help us to understand this variation across individuals, school settings, and broader community contexts (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Research on individual teacher characteristics, such as gender and race/ethnicity, suggests they may play a role in teacher victimization, and results yield mixed findings. Regarding gender, some studies indicate that violence is more common among women educators (e.g., Wei et al., 2013), whereas other studies have found violence to be more common among men (McMahon et al., 2014). Differences may be explained in part by the type of violence being reported. For example, McMahon and colleagues (2014) found that men were more likely to report obscene remarks, obscene gestures, verbal threats, and having a weapon pulled, whereas women were more likely to report experiencing intimidation. Thus, aggregated reports of violence can mask gender differences. Findings across race/ethnicity are also mixed, with some studies finding victimization to be more common among non-White educators and other studies reporting more prevalence among White teachers (McMahon et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2013). In some instances, teachers of certain racial/ethnic backgrounds (e.g., African American) have been found to be less likely to be victimized by certain perpetrators, such as parents and students (Martinez et al., 2015). Beyond demographic characteristics, there is evidence that intrapersonal factors such as attributions (i.e., characterological self-blame) also play a role in teacher-directed violence (Martinez et al., 2015).

Work has also revealed variations across school contexts and roles. For example, Tiesman and colleagues (2013) report that physical assault of school personnel is most likely to occur within the classroom (62.5%) followed by the hallway/stairway (28%), school office (5.2%), parking area (2.9%), or another location (11.4%; values sum to more than 100 due to a "check all that apply" condition). Specific circumstances also play a role, as violence often occurs when disciplining a student or breaking up a fight (Tiesman et al., 2013). Notable variations have also been found across teacher roles, with special education teachers at the highest risk of physical and nonphysical violence, followed by general education teachers (Tiesman et al., 2013). Teachers who report less support by their school principal are more susceptible to multiple victimizations across student, colleague, and parent perpetrators (Martinez et al., 2015). Thus, principals and school policies may serve as important foci for research and intervention. Although less is known about the role of broader community factors, studies indicate that

teachers working in urban settings are at greatest risk (McMahon et al., 2014; Robers et al., 2010). These variations across context and role are informative as they have implications for assessment and school intervention.

Assessment of Violence Against Teachers

Effective prevention and intervention for promoting educator safety is predicated on comprehensive and accurate measurement. Without reliable, valid, and contextualized assessments of violence against educators, issues of school safety will remain. Both interactional and social–ecological theories can serve as helpful frameworks for conceptualizing the methodological and measurement issues in understanding and preventing violence against teachers. Interactional perspectives focus on the temporal ordering of events leading to violence. This perspective examines events that precede the violent action (antecedents), behaviors, and consequences (Neuman & Baron, 2003). From a social–ecological perspective, violence against teachers must be viewed from a multidetermined, multisource, and multisystemic perspective (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Specifically, teachers interact with students, colleagues, administrators, and school- and district-level policies, and it is the assessment of these complex interactions that can help us understand and address violence against teachers.

Current Data Collection and Assessments

Kanrich and Reddy (2015) conducted a systematic review of 33 published and unpublished (1988–2015) investigations of violence against teachers, consisting of 48,433 educators and 85,426 students across 11 countries. They found the methodology and assessments used in the literature to be both diverse and limited. Using a structured review coding system, the literature was independently analyzed across five dimensions (characteristics of educators, students, and schools; methodology; outcomes) that included 40 variables yielding an average intercoder agreement (percent agreement) of .95. In this chapter, only a sample of variables related to data collection, assessments, and data analytic approaches is presented due to space limitations.

Measures

The majority of studies used surveys that measured constructs ranging from violence and victimization to stress, life satisfaction, school climate, and professional development (see Table 100.1). For example, six studies (18.2%) assessed victimization, violence, bullying, or harassment and six studies (18.2%) assessed school climate or school culture. Three studies (9.1%) examined teacher burnout or strain and three studies (9.1%) assessed educators' emotional and physical symptoms. Across the 33 studies, 48.5% reported only one psychometric index (i.e., internal consistency) on the measures used. To date, there is no validated measure for assessing teacher-directed violence.

Data sources and data analyses

Methods of data collection were reported in approximately 87% of the 33 studies, with the most frequently used method being mail, followed by web-based methods, in-person questionnaires or interviews, and telephone surveys. Data were gathered from various informants, with 67% assessing teachers, 21% assessing students, and 12% assessing school administrators;

Table 100.1 Measures used in the literature on violence against teachers.

Measure	Construct(s)	Psychometrics[a] (Informant)	Author of Measure
Measures of Victimization, Bullying, and Harassment			
Negative Acts Questionnaire	Perceived exposure to direct and indirect bullying behaviors	.97 (Teacher)	Einarsen & Raknes, 1997
Workplace Bullying Checklist	Bullying	.92 (Teacher)	Fox & Stallworth, 2005
Bullying Scale from the School Climate Bullying Survey	Extent of teasing and bullying at school	.77 (Student) .87 (Teacher)	Cornell & Sheras, 2003; McConville & Cornell, 2003
Effective School Battery	Student victimization	.72 (Student)	Gottfredson, 1999
Teacher Victimization Scale	Teachers' experience of victimization	.72 (Teacher)	Gottfredson, 1999
Questionnaire on Violent Behavior Against Teachers	Frequency of being the target of aggressive behavior from students	.78 (Teacher)	Tillmann et al., 1999
Schools and Staffing Survey	Student threats and assaults; perception of administrative support	.86 (Teacher)	National Center for Education Statistics, 2008
Measures of School Climate			
School Climate Survey–School Staff Version	Leadership; school–community relations	.84; .81 (Teacher)	Haynes et al., 1994
Organizational Focus Questionnaire	Degree to which schools have consistent and explicit goals	.94 (Teacher)	Gottfredson & Holland, 1997
Experiences of School Rules	Perception of school rules as fair	.74 (Teacher)	National Center for Education Statistics, 2005
Daily Structure Scale	Perception of how strictly school rules are enforced	.54 (Student)	Cornell, 2006
Learning Environment Scale	Perception of school support	.96 (Student)	Austin & Duerr, 2005
Help Seeking Scale	Willingness to seek help from school staff for bullying and threats of violence	.89 (Teacher)	Cornell & Sheras, 2003
California School Climate Survey	Use of violence toward peers and staff	.76 toward peers; .81 toward staff (Student)	Benbenishty, 2003
Questionnaire of School Culture	Time pressure; quality of school environment; student-oriented education; aggressive teacher behavior; achievement-oriented education; discipline-oriented education; teacher commitment; collegial support	.73; .72; .86; .60; .66; .69; .61; .86 (Teacher)	Tillmann et al., 1999

(Continued)

Table 100.1 (*Continued*)

Measure	Construct(s)	Psychometrics[a] (Informant)	Author of Measure
Measures of Burnout or Strain			
Maslach Burnout Inventory	Emotional exhaustion; depersonalization; personal accomplishment	.89; .73; .76 (Teacher)	Maslach & Jackson, 1981
Oldenburg Burnout Inventory	Burnout	.92 (Teacher)	Demerouti & Nachreiner, 1996; Halbesleben & Demerouti, 2005
Strain Questionnaire	Class-oriented strain; social strain	.73; .72 (Teacher)	Van Dick, 1999
Positive Affect Scale	How often teachers experience different affect states	.71 (Teacher)	Dzuka & Dalbert, 2007
Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale	Job-related emotions	.90 (Teacher)	Van Katwyk et al., 2000
Physical Symptom Inventory	Physical health symptoms	.85 (Teacher)	Spector & Jex, 1998
Moos Depression Scale	Frequency of depressive symptoms	.92 (Teacher)	Billings & Moos, 1982
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory	Intensity of anxiety symptoms	.90 (Teacher)	Spielberger & Sydeman, 1994
General Life Satisfaction Scale	Satisfaction with one's present and past life and future	.90 (Teacher)	Dalbert, Montada, Schmitt, & Schneider, 1984
Michigan Organizational Assessment Scale	Job satisfaction	.90 (Teacher)	Cammann et al., 1979
Other Measures			
Personal Belief in a Just World Scale	Belief that events in one's life are just	.85 (Teacher)	Dalbert, 1999
Teacher Follow-Up Survey	Teacher attrition	Not available (Teacher)	National Center for Education Statistics, 2009

[a] Cronbach's alpha reported.

only 15% gathered data from multiple informants (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005).

Regarding data analyses, only 43% of the 33 studies provided descriptive statistics. Although inferential statistics were used in the majority of studies (81.8%), there was a range of tests used. Specifically, frequencies or percentages were reported most often (88.9%), followed by regression analyses (55.6%), correlations (40.7%), and chi-square independence tests (25.9%). Only a handful of studies employed multiple methods and/or more advanced data analysis techniques. Additionally, there was limited information on causality and long-term implications of teacher-directed violence, as most studies were cross-sectional. In sum, the methodological designs and analyses used within this body of research are limited, offering opportunities for measurement development and validation.

Directions for Assessment

Rigorous and comprehensive investigations that examine individual and contextual risk and protective factors are needed. While numerous measures exist to study violence against students, reliable and valid school-based assessments are not available to assess teacher-directed violence. This gap underscores the need for additional measures as well as web-based data systems to facilitate collection, management, and use of data related to educator victimization.

First, a reliable transnational data source is needed so as to establish the human and financial costs of educator victimization. Concerns of school safety discourage prospective educators from entering the field and prompt educators to leave the profession (Espelage, Anderman et al., 2013). Likewise, research has underscored that job-related stress (e.g., caused by victimization) may lead to job dissatisfaction and lower levels of commitment to teaching (Klassen, Usher, & Bong, 2010). An anonymous, web-based transnational educator safety registry would provide an evidence-based and secure mechanism for educators and school administrators to report and track incidence and prevalence locally, regionally, and nationally. Such a registry would serve as a data source that would enhance understanding of teacher victimization and guide decision making for policy makers, local school action, and research.

Second, there is no convergence on the type of research methodology and assessments for this area (Kanrich & Reddy, 2015). Likewise, available school assessments lack validity evidence. Given this void in school measures, we recommend multidimensional assessments that capture constructs and sources from a social–ecological perspective. For example, measures are needed that include educator and school system characteristics (e.g., Martinez et al., 2015; McMahon et al., 2014), school policies and procedures (e.g., McMahon, Keys, Berardi, & Crouch, 2011), and school supports such as leadership skills, relational quality, and opportunities to obtain help (e.g., Türküm, 2011). Similarly, we recommend that school safety assessments adopt a 360-degree assessment approach that captures the perspectives of teacher(s), students, parents/guardians, and school administrators (Reddy, Espelage, Anderman, & Kanrich, 2016). Data generated from multidimensional and multisource assessments can help to pinpoint risk and protective factors that inform data-based decisions, policies, and practices.

Finally, as a complex phenomenon, violence against teachers requires integrated assessment-intervention approaches that identify and monitor individual, group, and contextual processes that may prevent and foster violence in schools. School prevention and intervention efforts would benefit from the development of web-based formative assessments that assess and track educators' safety during and across multiple school years. Web-based school safety assessments that include educators', students', and school leaders' perspectives would allow for efficient and ongoing assessment of changes in safety. These assessments would also provide meaningful, time-sensitive information on the fidelity of interventions and school-level outcomes (Reddy et al., 2016).

Violence Prevention Interventions

Many programs and interventions have been used to prevent and reduce violence in schools. Almost all of these efforts have focused on violence and aggression toward students. Nevertheless, school personnel and other members of the school community stand to benefit

from these programs as well. New efforts incorporating prevention of violence against teachers can be enhanced by prior research with students.

Violence prevention efforts, to date, can be organized into types of interventions: (1) general management practices that are used to manage student behavior in classrooms (e.g., classroom management) and (2) specific or targeted interventions that are directed toward particular problem behaviors (e.g., bullying), specific populations (e.g., aggressive students), or particular age groups or developmental levels (e.g., first-graders). We discuss these interventions in the following sections, as each offers implications for efforts aimed at the prevention of violence against educators.

General Management Practices

Foremost, educators have successfully prevented and deterred violence from occurring by carefully considering numerous aspects of the classroom environment that are related to violence and aggression and establishing patterns and expectations early in the school year. Effective teachers attend to the physical layout of the classroom (e.g., Carter & Doyle, 2006); promote a sense of belonging and a positive climate (e.g., Anderman, 2002; Juvonen, 2006); establish clear and understandable rules (e.g., Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, & Crnobori, 2011); engage students in their academic work (e.g., Pas, Cash, O'Brennan, Debnam, & Bradshaw, 2015); and appropriately deal with misbehavior (e.g., Evans, Wilde, & Axelrod, 2009; Ormrod, Anderman, & Anderman, 2016). Educators who attend to these issues report fewer instances of behavioral problems, including violence and aggression, improving school safety (Espelage, Anderman et al., 2013).

Specific and Targeted Interventions

Interventions can also target more specific problem behaviors. The use of a three-tiered approach is often effective, wherein *primary prevention strategies* are implemented and designed to foster positive behaviors among the student population (e.g., George, Kinkaid, & Pollard-Sage, 2009). Primary prevention programs are generally administered by teachers in classrooms. For example, conflict-resolution programs can be implemented with a large group of students all at once; such programs have reduced antisocial behaviors, most notably during early adolescence (e.g., Garrard & Lipsey, 2007). Many schools also implement antibullying programs aimed at entire classrooms and schools, and these too can be effective, although the sustainability of such programs needs to be more consistently addressed (Bradshaw, 2015). *Secondary prevention strategies* are implemented to focus on students who are at high risk for violence or aggression. These efforts may include classroom-based violence prevention programs implemented by teachers collaborating with staff in urban schools that serve at-risk youth (e.g., McMahon & Washburn, 2003). *Tertiary strategies* are targeted for use with students already demonstrating aggressive or violent behavior (Dwyer & Osher, 2000; Espelage, Anderman et al., 2013). Functional-assessment-based interventions and strategies take into account contexts in which students misbehave and consequences of student actions, and are particularly effective with aggressive students. Then individualized interventions are used to target the causes of specific problem behaviors (e.g., Lane et al., 2007; Lane, Oakes, & Menzies, 2010). Environments can be manipulated to alter problematic behavioral patterns that affect safety for both students and school staff.

Applying Prevention Efforts to Teachers

In order to address violence against teachers, comprehensive efforts are needed that address the entire ecology of the school. Such efforts need to account for the multiple levels of influence and complex interactions among systems that have been addressed to some degree in student-focused efforts (i.e., student, teacher, and school level). Teachers' needs and experiences must be incorporated into student- and school-based assessment and intervention.

We can learn from the numerous programs that have been developed for students. One of the challenges in examining student violence prevention interventions is that there is an array of possible outcomes that can be affected by these interventions; some of these outcomes may benefit teachers whereas others may not. Thus, although school-based violence prevention programs can successfully reduce aggressive behaviors (e.g., Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011), many violence prevention programs have not been successful at reducing violence *across a wide range of outcomes simultaneously*. Thus, teachers may benefit somewhat if overall aggression decreases, but direct positive effects for teachers may require more targeted interventions for teachers.

It is particularly important to examine the efficacy of prevention programs in terms of their effects on outcomes *as well as on mediating variables*, which many studies do not include (Dymnicki, Weissberg, & Henry, 2011). In a meta-analysis examining violence prevention programs aimed at elementary school students, results indicate that potentially important mediators include (1) the acquisition of skills by students (e.g., conflict-resolution skills), (2) social–cognitive processes (e.g., metacognitive processes in which students self-reflect about thoughts and actions), and (3) classroom characteristics (e.g., classroom climates focused on nonviolent, peaceful resolutions of conflicts; Dymnicki et al., 2011). Thus, mediators may be considered in the prevention of violence against teachers.

An Intervention to Address Violence Against Teachers: A Social–Ecological Approach

A social–ecological perspective should also guide intervention. An intervention to address violence against teachers needs to target risk and protective factors at each level of the social ecology, including individuals, classrooms, schools, families, and communities. Bronfenbrenner and Evans (2000) expanded their ecological model to consider the notion that systems can be chaotic, and exposure to chaotic systems can have deleterious effects on social development. Chaotic systems are often characterized as frantic, lacking in structure, and unpredictable, which could describe many schools and homes where youth spend their time. Considering chaos seems particularly informative given that more disorganized schools have higher rates of violence (Foster & Brooks-Gunn, 2013). Our proposed intervention targets each level of the social ecology and argues for minimizing chaos.

In order to minimize chaos and the likelihood that teachers will experience violence, interventions must include comprehensive strategies; necessary resources (e.g., staff, services, funding); positive relations between students, teachers, staff, and administration; nonpunitive and equitable disciplinary policies; nonviolent norms; and clear behavioral expectations. Chaos often emerges in schools because of the high rates of turnover in administration, teachers, and support staff. These changes are often not anticipated and can create a negative climate if not addressed directly.

Microsystem

From the social–ecological perspective, social settings where children have direct contact with other people are referred to as the "microsystem," which includes peers, family, and schools. An intervention designed to prevent violence against teachers should educate all adults in the school about how to manage their classrooms in order to provide structure, consistency, and clear behavioral expectations. Research has shown that, in classrooms where teachers promote prosocial behaviors and equity, youth with a genetic marker of aggression do not behave aggressively (Brendgen, Girard, Vitaro, Dionne, & Boivin, 2013). One method for creating prosocial classrooms is for teachers to work with students in collaborative groups and implement social–emotional learning lessons (Durlak et al., 2011; Espelage, 2015). These programs can teach students how to regulate their emotions, control their impulses, communicate more effectively, resolve conflicts peacefully, and develop healthy problem-solving strategies. Indeed, these social–emotional learning programs have yielded reductions in disruptive classroom behaviors (Durlak et al., 2011) and physical aggression among students (Espelage, Low, Polanin, & Brown, 2013), which could indirectly contribute to reductions in violence directed toward teachers.

However, programs directed at improving student behaviors are likely to have only limited success if they are not embedded in a larger school improvement process that involves all members of the school. School climate reform is an improvement process that engages all members of the school community in ways that recognize both the community's local needs and goals and adults' and students' behavior and learning (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009). Practitioners and school administrators need to first assess perceptions of school climate by surveying staff, parents, and students. These data can then be used by school-wide school climate committees and practitioners to create a school improvement plan. Such efforts might include developing a code of conduct that reinforces values of caring, respect, and fairness; enforcing consequences of aggression; establishing nonthreatening ways for teachers to report violence (e.g., ensuring confidentiality); and training school personnel in identifying and responding to potentially violent incidents.

Mesosystem

Mesosystems consist of interconnections between microsystems and can include a multitude of interactions that may not involve a child, including how parents communicate with teachers and staff. McMahon and colleagues (2014) found that parents are also perpetrators of violence of against teachers—37% of the victimizations reported by teachers were perpetrated by parents in a sample of nearly 3,000 teachers. Thus, an intervention to reduce violence against teachers should involve parents in order to achieve better outcomes. Otherwise, the messages children receive from school and home may be inconsistent. In a sample of ninth-grade African American males transitioning to high school, lower levels of parental involvement in school were associated with lower student self-esteem and academic success (Patton, Woolley, & Hong, 2012).

Exosystem

The exosystem is the social context with which the child does not have direct contact but which affects youth indirectly through the microsystem. Numerous aspects of the communities where youth reside could lead to a heightened risk of violence within and outside school.

For example, when youth have limited resources for prosocial activities and opportunities to interact with prosocial peers, when there is a high concentration of economic disadvantage and drug exposure, the likelihood of violence is increased, especially among inner-city and rural communities (McGrath, Johnson, & Miller, 2012). Thus, an intervention program needs to establish community partnerships to bolster opportunities for youth to interact with positive peers and adult role models, reduce substance use and sales, and enhance economic resources and opportunities.

Macrosystem

The macrosystem level is commonly regarded as a cultural "blueprint" that may determine the social structures and activities in the various levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). This level includes organizational, social, cultural, and political contexts, which influence the interactions within other system levels (e.g., state legislation, discipline policies). Sociological theorists assert that school norms can perpetuate inequality, alienation, aggression, and oppression among students in relation to their race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic background (Leach, 2003). For example, based on zero-tolerance policies, "school safety" is often used as a rationale for exclusionary discipline practices, but it is evident that the use of disciplinary referrals, suspension, and expulsion is not equitable across race/ethnicity (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002). Broader social–cultural beliefs can become manifest in unequal disciplinary practices, which can then underlie teacher-directed violence. In fact, research by Tiesman and colleagues (2013) indicates that violence directed toward teachers can occur when students are disciplined. Thus, the social–cultural beliefs and attributions that underlie behavioral management practices can also serve as an area for intervention (Martinez et al., 2015).

Future Directions for the Field

The field of violence prevention has largely focused on students. While students play important roles in this societal problem, teacher roles and experiences have largely been ignored. We now have a clear understanding that teacher victimization is a significant problem that needs to be examined and addressed through a theory-based approach in addition to and in conjunction with student victimization. Social–ecological models are useful in considering direct, indirect, and dynamic effects on development and behavior across multiple levels of influence. Assessment tools for teacher victimization have lagged far behind student-based measures, so considerable effort is needed to develop reliable and valid measures. Violence prevention interventions have also been student focused, including both general management strategies and specific targeted interventions. A holistic approach to addressing violence needs to incorporate students, teachers, staff, administrators, parents, and school districts as well as factors that indirectly affect youth and teachers. Strategies may include implementing positive behavioral expectations, training teachers in classroom management and crisis intervention, creating positive school norms and climates conducive to teaching and learning, developing and implementing clear and consistent policies, enhancing communication and support across and between systems, and providing adequate resources. We need to reduce the stress, turnover, and victimization that teachers experience, and focus on creating an effective teaching and learning environment where everyone feels safe.

References

Anderman, E. M. (2002). School effects on psychological outcomes during adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(4), 795–809. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.795

Austin, G., & Duerr, M. (2005). *Guidebook for the California Healthy Kids Survey. Part III: School Climate Survey for teachers and other staff 2005–2006 edition*. Retrieved November 8, 2016, from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED486328

Benbenishty, R. (2003). *A national study of school violence in Israel*. Jerusalem, Israel: Israeli Ministry of Education.

Billings, A. G., & Moos, R. H. (1982). Stressful life events and symptoms: A longitudinal model. *Health Psychology*, *1*, 99–117. doi:10.1037//0278-6133.1.2.99

Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Translating research to practice in bullying prevention. *American Psychologist*, *70*(4), 322–332. doi:10.1037/a0039114

Brendgen, M., Girard, A., Vitaro, F., Dionne, G., & Boivin, M. (2013). Gene–environment correlation linking aggression and peer victimization: Do classroom behavioral norms matter? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *43*(1), 19–31. doi:10.1007/s10802-013-9807-z

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, *32*, 513–531. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.32.7.513

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social Development*, *9*(1), 115–125. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00114

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Carter, K., & Doyle, W. (2006). Classroom management in early childhood and elementary classrooms. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 373–406). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J., McCabe, E. M., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, teacher education and practice. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(1), 180–213.

Cornell, D. G. (2006). *Bullying Climate Scale*. Unpublished scale, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Cornell, D. G., & Sheras, P. L. (2003). *The School Climate Bullying Survey*. Unpublished survey and report, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Dalbert, C. (1999). The world is more just for me than generally: About the Personal Belief in a Just World Scale's validity. *Social Justice Research*, *12*, 79–98. doi:10.1023/a:1022091609047

Dalbert, C., Montada, L., Schmitt, M., & Schneider, A. (1984). *Existentielle Schuld: Ergebnisse der Item- und Skalenanalysen [Existential guilt: Results of item and scale analyses]* (Working Group "Verantwortung, Gerechtigkeit, Moral" Report No. 24). Department of Psychology, University of Trier, Trier, Germany.

Demerouti, E., & Nachreiner, F. (1996). Reliabilität und Validität des Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI): Eine kritische Betrachtung [Reliability and validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A critical note. *Zeitschrift für Arbeitswissenschaft*, *50*, 32–38.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, *82*, 405–432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Dwyer, K., & Osher, D. (2000). *Safeguarding our children: An action guide*. Washington, DC: US Departments of Education and Justice, American Institutes for Research. RetrievedNovember 8, 2016, from https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/actguide/action_guide.pdf

Dymnicki, A. B., Weissberg, R. P., & Henry, D. B. (2011). Understanding how programs work to prevent overt aggressive behaviors: A meta-analysis of mediators of elementary school-based programs. *Journal of School Violence*, *10*(4), 315–337. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.602599

Dzuka, J., & Dalbert, C. (2007). Student violence against teachers: Teachers' well-being and the belief in a just world. *European Psychologist*, *12*, 253–260. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.12.4.253

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, *12*, 247–263.

Espelage, D. L. (2015). Preventing youth violence & bullying through social–emotional school-based prevention programmes & frameworks. In C. Ward & P. Donnolly (Eds.), *Violence: A global health priority* (pp. 155–160). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Espelage, D. L., Anderman, E. M., Brown, V. E., Jones, A., Lane, K. L., McMahon, S. D., … Reynolds, C. R. (2013). Understanding and preventing violence directed against teachers: Recommendations for a national research, practice, and policy agenda. *American Psychologist*, *68*(2), 75–87. doi:10.1037/a0031307

Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Polanin, J., & Brown, E. (2013). The impact of a middle-school program to reduce aggression, victimization, and sexual violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *53*(2), 180–186. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.02.021

Evans, V. A., Wilde, N. C., & Axelrod, S. (2009). Classroom management: Overview. In E. M. Anderman & L. H. Anderman (Eds.), *Psychology of classroom learning: An encyclopedia* (pp. 162–166). Detroit, MI: Cengage.

Foster, H., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2013). Neighborhood, family and individual influences on school physical victimization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(10), 1596–1610. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9890-4

Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*(3), 438–456. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.002

Garrard, W. M., & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). Conflict resolution education and antisocial behavior in US schools: A meta-analysis. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *25*(1), 9–38. doi:10.1002/crq.188

George, H. P., Kincaid, D., & Pollard-Sage, J. (2009). Primary-tier interventions and supports. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlop, G. Sugai, R. Horner, W. Sailor, G. Dunlop, … R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 375–394). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-09632-2_16

Gerberich, S. G., Nachreiner, N. M., Ryan, A. D., Church, T. R., McGovern, P. M., Geisser, M. S., … Pinder, E. D. (2011). Violence against educators: A population-based study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *53*, 294–302. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e31820c3fa1

Gottfredson, G. D. (1999). *User's manual for the Effective School Battery*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.

Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., Payne, A. A., & Gottfredson, N. C. (2005). School climate predictors of school disorder: Results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, *42*, 412–444. doi:10.1177/0022427804271931

Gottfredson, G. D., & Holland, J. L. (1997). EIS Organizational Focus Questionnaire. In J. L. Holland (Ed.), *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed., pp. 273–275). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Gray, L., & Taie, S. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study (NCES 2015–337)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Demerouti, E. (2005). The construct validity of an alternative measure of burnout: Investigating the English translation of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. *Work & Stress*, *19*(3), 208–220. doi:10.1080/02678370500340728

Juvonen, J. (2006). Sense of belonging, social bonds, and school functioning. In P. A. Alexander, P. H. Winne, P. A. Alexander, & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 655–674). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kanrich, J., & Reddy, L. A. (2015). *Violence against educators: A critical review of findings and methodology*. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University, NJ.

Klassen, R. M., Usher, E. L., & Bong, M. (2010). Teachers' collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and job stress in cross-cultural context. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *78*, 464–486. doi:10.1080/00220970903292975

Lane, K. L., Menzies, H. M., Bruhn, A. L., & Crnobori, M. (2011). *Managing challenging behaviors in schools: Research-based strategies that work*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., & Menzies, H. M. (2010). Systematic screenings to prevent the development of learning and behavior problems: Considerations for practitioners, researchers, and policy makers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *21*, 160–172. doi:10.1177/1044207310379123

Lane, K. L., Rogers, L. A., Parks, R. J., Weisenbach, J. L., Mau, A. C., Merwin, M. T., & Bergman, W. A. (2007). Function-based interventions for students who are nonresponsive to primary and secondary prevention efforts: Illustrations at the elementary and middle school levels. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *15*(3), 169–183. doi:10.1177/10634266070150030401

Leach, F. (2003). Learning to be violent: The role of the school in developing adolescent gendered behaviour. *Compare*, *33*, 385–400. doi:10.1080/03057920302587

Levin, P. F., Martinez, M. Q., Walcott-McQuigg, J., Chen, S. P., Amman, M., & Guenette, C. (2006). Injuries associated with teacher assaults. *American Association of Occupational Health Nurses Journal*, *54*, 210–216.

Martinez, A., McMahon, S. D., Espelage, D. L., Anderman, E., Reddy, L., & Sanchez, B. (2015). Teachers' experiences with multiple victimization: Identifying demographic, cognitive, and contextual correlates. *Journal of School Violence*, *15*(4), 387–405. doi:10.1080/15388220.2015.1056879

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *2*, 99–113. doi:10.1002/job.4030020205

McConville, D., & Cornell, D. (2003). Attitudes toward aggression and aggressive behavior among middle school students. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *11*, 179–187. doi:10.1177/10634266030110030501

McGrath, S. A., Johnson, M., & Miller, M. H. (2012). The social ecological challenges of rural victim advocacy: An exploratory study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *40*(5), 588–606. doi:10.1002/jcop.21484

McMahon, S. D., Keys, C. B., Berardi, L., & Crouch, R. (2011). The ecology of achievement among students diverse in ethnicity and ability. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *39*, 645–662. doi:10.1002/jcop.20458

McMahon, S. D., Martinez, A., Espelage, D. L., Rose, L. A., Reddy, C., Lane, K., … Brown, V. (2014). Violence directed against teachers: Results from a national survey. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*, 753–766. doi:10.1002/pits.21777

McMahon, S. D., & Washburn, J. (2003). Violence prevention: An evaluation of program effects with urban African American youth. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, *24*, 43–62. doi:10.1023/a:1025075617356

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *School crime supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey 2005*. Retrieved October 3, 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/Crime/surveys.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *School district questionnaire: Schools and staffing survey*. Retrieved October 3, 2016, from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/pdf/0708/sass1a.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Teacher follow-up survey: Questionnaire for current teachers*. Retrieved October 3, 2016, from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/pdf/0809/tfs_3.pdf

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2003). Social antecedents of bullying: A social interactionist perspective. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 185–202). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Ormrod, J., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2016). *Educational psychology: Developing learners* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Pas, E. T., Cash, A. H., O'Brennan, L., Debnam, K. J., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Profiles of classroom behavior in high schools: Associations with teacher behavior management strategies and classroom composition. *Journal of School Psychology*, *53*(2), 137–148. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2014.12.005

Patton, D. U., Woolley, M. E., & Hong, J. S. (2012). Exposure to violence, student fear, and low academic achievement: African American males in the critical transition to highschool. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *34*(2), 388–395. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.11.009

Reddy, L. A., Espelage, D., Anderman, E., & Kanrich, J. (2016). *Addressing violence against educators through measurement and research (White Paper)*. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.

Robers, S., Zhang, J., & Truman, J. (2010), November. *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2010.* Washington, DC: US Department of Education/Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved October 3, 2016, from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/iscs10.pdf

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review*, *34*, 317–342. doi:10.1023/A:1021320817372

Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *3*(4), 356–367. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.3.4.356

Spielberger, C., & Sydeman, S. J. (1994). State-trait anxiety inventory and state-trait anger expression inventory. In M. E. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcome assessment* (pp. 292–321). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tiesman, H., Konda, S., Hendricks, S., Mercer, D., & Amandus, H. (2013). Workplace violence among Pennsylvania education workers: Differences among occupations. *Journal of Safety Research*, *44*, 65–71. doi:10.1016/j.jsr.2012.09.006

Tillmann, K. J., Hollernowitzki, B., Holtappels, H. G., Meier, U., & Popp, U. (1999). *Schülergewalt als Schulproblem: Verursachende Bedingungen, Erscheinungsformen und pädagogische Handlungsperspektiven [Pupils power as a school problem: Causing conditions, manifestations and educational action perspectives].* Weinheim, Germany: Juventa.

Türküm A. S. (2011). Social supports preferred by the teachers when facing school violence. *Children Youth Services Review*, *33*, 644–650. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.11.005

Van Dick, R. (1999). *Stress and job satisfaction in the teaching profession: An analysis of stress and strain in the context of social psychology, clinical psychology and organizational psychology concepts (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. University of Marburg, Germany.

Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(2), 219–230. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.5.2.219

Wei, C., Gerberich, S. G., Alexander, B. H., Ryan, A. D., Nachreiner, N. M., & Mongin, S. J. (2013). Work-related violence against educators in Minnesota: Rates and risks based on hours exposed. *Journal of Safety Research*, *44*, 73–85. doi:10.1016/j.jsr.2012.12.005

ABSTRACT

Although violence prevention has largely focused on students, national and state-level studies suggest that teacher-directed violence warrants attention by researchers, policy makers, and school stakeholders. In this chapter, we provide an overview of the empirical literature on teacher-directed violence, including the extent of the problem, types of violence teachers experience, measurement issues, and how this problem varies across perpetrators and social contexts. We specify recommendations for assessment, including developing and using reliable and valid measures to better understand teachers' experiences with violence. Violence prevention approaches are described, and we advocate for assessment and intervention that incorporate teacher experiences. Using a social–ecological model, we outline intervention strategies that address school violence that affects students, teachers, and administrators at the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem levels. Ultimately, we need to take the entire school ecology into account to reduce violence and create an effective teaching and learning environment where everyone feels safe.

KEYWORDS

aggression, school, social–ecological, teacher, victimization, violence prevention